



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,180	09/19/2001	Koji Miyajima	434620-096	9415
46188	7590	07/23/2010	EXAMINER	
Nixon Peabody LLP			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
P.O. Box 60610				
Palo Alto, CA 94306			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2424	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/955,180	MIYAJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	REUBEN M. BROWN	2424	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/22/10</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In view of the new IDS filed, 1/22/10, new rejection on the merits is being issued.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, (US PG-PUB 2003/0061370), in view of Alred, (GB 2,327,514 A).

Considering claim 1, the claimed video distribution system that distributes video data to a user terminal that can connect to a network, comprising;

'a distribution list generating device that generates a distribution list that defines a distribution order of the video data of the user terminal and includes a link name that links video data as a distribution request destination', reads on the streaming server 22 of Nakayama that sends out requested audio/video clips 42a-42c. The claimed '*distribution order*' reads on the

example of the sequential order of clips 42a, 42b, 42c; Para [0058] & Fig. 4. The claimed ‘*link name that links video data*’, reads on the HTML address for each file, such as for instance URL = <http://fujisan.gmsnet.or.jp/hylink/kanda.htmlu>, disclosed in Fig. 4 & Para [0051]. The claimed ‘*user terminal*’ corresponds with the WWW browser 11 and streaming player 12, [0096].

‘*link list generating device that generates a link list that is a correspondence list between the link name and a video data file name corresponding to the link name*’, reads on the server 21 that creates and maintains the Document base directory names and the Management Files Name List Files, which is the list of management information for the list of files stored at the database, Para [0064-0068] & Figs. 7-8. The claimed, ‘*video data file name*’, corresponds with the file name shown as the last two terms after the backslash in the URL, for instance, kanda.htmlu is the file name in the above URL.

The additionally claimed feature, ‘*and stores the link list into the video distribution system*’, is broad enough to read on above passage of Para [0064-0068]. The server computer 21 maintains an integration 23aa and management file name list files 23ab.

‘*link list updating device that updates the video data file name corresponding to the link name in the instant link list to another video data file name depending on distribution condition, wherein the video data is distributed based on the link list*’ reads on the disclosure in Nakayama of changing, i.e., updating the file names of certain files stored at the server 21, at least based on the congestion of the distribution system which reads on the claimed, ‘depending on distribution

condition', see [0006-0009 & 0112-0114]. In particular, Nakayama discloses that when an updated version of a file is available at a server computer 20, that the server computer 20 will transmit the updated version (at least to a local recording medium; i.e., auxiliary storage 14), Para [0099]. This process is done at least for the purpose of avoiding problems of congestion on the network, Para [0095], which meets the claimed limitation of, '*updates the video data file name corresponding to another video data file name depending on distribution conditions*'.

The additional feature of '*the updating being conducted exclusively by the video distribution system*', it appears that in Nakayama, a new file name is detected by the receiver. However Alred, which is in the same field of endeavor, provides an additional teaching of accessing websites by using an indirect algorithm from the server, see pages 17 thru 18. In particular, Alred teaches that when a client requests a particular hyperlink from a webpage, the server will check to see if the instant hyperlink is still valid. If the instant hyperlink is not valid, then the server will deliver the content with respect to the valid hyperlink, to the client. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Nakayama with the feature of indirect access of hyperlinks, for the desirable advantage of providing updated content to a consumer, without the need for the consumer to change his/her bookmarks, as taught by Alred, see pages 5, lines 24-41, page 6, lines 1-25; page 7, lines 28-41 thru page 8, lines 1-22.

Considering claims 2, 9 & 12 '*wherein, in the case in which the video data is associated with distribution condition information that includes as the distribution condition information at*

least one of, ‘time and duration information’, ‘area information that designates the distribution area’, ‘cumulative distribution number information that limits the cumulative number of distributions’ and ‘attribute information about the user’, is met by the discussion of Nakayama that many large files are being transmitted, the situation may cause an overloading of lines, which may be solved by caching contents on different medium at the server or locally or with the client, Para [0006-0009].

Considering claims 3-5, the claimed subject matter reads on the discussion in Nakayama [0055-0059; 0091] that the video data file names are updated, in view of Alred, pages 6-8.

Considering claim 6, the claimed, *‘updating device updating the video data file by referring to the priority order list that determines priority order in the distribution of the video data’*, again reads on the sequential order of video clips shown in Fig. 4; 42a, 42b, 42c, in view of Alred, pages 6-8.

Considering claims 7-8 & 10, the claimed video distribution system that distributes video data user terminal comprises features that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1 and is likewise treated.

Considering claims 11 & 13, the claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program that comprise that which correspond with subject matter mentioned above in

the rejection of claims 1 & 7-8, and are likewise treated. As for the claimed computer readable medium, Nakayama meets the limitation.

Considering claims 14, 19, 24, 29, 34 & 39, again, the claimed subject matter reads on the disclosure Nakayama of the sequential order of audio/video clips 42a,42b,42c, see col. 19, lines 31-65; col. 20, lines 16-52.

Considering claims 15, 20, 25; 30, 35 & 40, the claimed '*obtains a distribution state*', reads on the version number & super version number, which are used by the proxy server 13 and file server 20 to keep track of which files have been updated, Para [0085 & 0101]. And '*updating the video data file name corresponding to the link name to the other video data file name in accordance with the distribution state thus obtained and distribution conditions*', reads on the updated version of the content, as discussed in the analysis of claims 14, 19, 24 & 29.

Considering claims 16, 21, 26 & 31, the claimed subject matter reads on Para [0096-0099].

Considering claims 17, 22, 27, 32, 36, 37, 41 & 42, the claimed subject matter reads on the Management File Name List Files, discussed in Nakayama [0067-0068].

Considering claims 18, 23, 28, 33, 38 & 43, the claimed subject matter reads on the discussion in Nakayama of updating the files, in local proxy server 13 with the names of the files in the distribution server 21, using the Management File Name List Files, [0062-0068].

Considering claim 44, since Nakayama is an interactive system, the claimed subject matter reads on any particular user choosing a particular path, according to the selections. Therefore, the updates associated with the content of a particular user, would necessarily be different from a user that chose a different path of selections.

Considering claim 45, the claimed subject matter reads on Para [0084-0094], which teaches that the system detects the different version number attached to a request from a browser 11, in that that instance the server sends out the content from the updated file.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - A) Goldick Teaches a system that updates file names, including the new version names of the instant files.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Reuben M. Brown/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424